

ATTRACTORS FOR SINGULARLY PERTURBED HYPERBOLIC EQUATIONS ON UNBOUNDED DOMAINS

MARTINO PRIZZI — KRZYSZTOF P. RYBAKOWSKI

ABSTRACT. For an arbitrary unbounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and for $\varepsilon > 0$, we consider the damped hyperbolic equations

$$(H_\varepsilon) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon u_{tt} + u_t + \beta(x)u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij}(x)u_{x_j})_{x_i} &= f(x, u), \quad x \in \Omega, t \in [0, \infty[, \\ u(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t \in [0, \infty[. \end{aligned}$$

and their singular limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, i.e. the parabolic equation

$$(P) \quad \begin{aligned} u_t + \beta(x)u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij}(x)u_{x_j})_{x_i} &= f(x, u), \quad x \in \Omega, t \in [0, \infty[, \\ u(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t \in [0, \infty[. \end{aligned}$$

Under suitable assumptions, (H_ε) possesses a compact global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ in the phase space $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, while (P) possesses a compact global attractor $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_0$ in the phase space $H_0^1(\Omega)$, which can be embedded into a compact set $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$. We show that, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the family $(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in [0, \infty[}$ is upper semicontinuous with respect to the topology of $H_0^1(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$. We thus extend a well known result by Hale and Raugel in three directions: first, we allow f to have critical growth; second, we let Ω be unbounded; last, we do not make any smoothness assumption on $\partial\Omega$, $\beta(\cdot)$, $a_{ij}(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot, u)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

In their paper [13] Hale and Raugel considered the damped hyperbolic equations

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon u_{tt} + u_t - \Delta u &= f(u) + g(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t \in [0, \infty[, \\ u(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t \in [0, \infty[. \end{aligned}$$

and their singular limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, i.e. the parabolic equation

$$\begin{aligned} u_t - \Delta u &= f(u) + g(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t \in [0, \infty[, \\ u(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t \in [0, \infty[. \end{aligned}$$

In [13] the set Ω is a bounded smooth domain or a convex polyhedron, ε is a positive constant, $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ and f is a C^2 function of subcritical growth such that

$$\limsup_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(u)}{u} \leq 0.$$

1

Under these assumptions, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ the corresponding hyperbolic equation generates a global semiflow which possesses a compact global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ in the phase space $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ (see [2,8,12]). Moreover, the limiting parabolic equation generates a global semiflow which possesses a compact global attractor $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_0$ in the phase space $H_0^1(\Omega)$ (see [5,12]). Due to the smoothing effect of parabolic equations, it turns out that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_0$ is actually a compact subset of $H^2(\Omega)$. Hence one can define the set

$$\mathcal{A}_0 = \{(u, \Delta u + f(u) + g) \mid u \in \mathcal{A}_0\},$$

which is a compact subset of $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$. Hale and Raugel proved that the family $(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in [0, \infty[}$ is upper semicontinuous with respect to the topology of $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, i.e.

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_0} |y - z|_{H_0^1 \times L^2} = 0.$$

In this paper we extend the result of Hale and Raugel in three directions: firstly, we allow f to have critical growth; secondly, we let Ω be unbounded; thirdly, we replace $f(u) + g(x)$ by $f(x, u)$ and $-\Delta$ by $\beta(x)u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij}(x)u_{x_j})_{x_i}$, without any smoothness assumption on $\partial\Omega$, $\beta(\cdot)$, $a_{ij}(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot, u)$.

In [13] the proof of the main result relies on some uniform $(H^2 \times H^1)$ -estimates for the attractors $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$, combined with the compactness of the Sobolev embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$. The uniform $(H^2 \times H^1)$ -estimates are obtained through a bootstrapping argument originally due to Haraux [14]. Such argument works only if f is subcritical, and if Ω is such that the domain of the $L^2(\Omega)$ -realization of $-\Delta$ is $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ (e.g. if Ω is a convex polyhedron).

A different bootstrapping argument was proposed by Grasselli and Pata in [10,11]. Their argument also works in the critical case, and is based on certain a-priori estimates that can be obtained “within an appropriate Galerkin approximation scheme”. Here, “appropriate” means “on a basis of eigenfunctions of $-\Delta$ ”. Therefore, their approach cannot be used in the case of an unbounded domain Ω . More recently, in [15] Pata and Zelik obtained $(H^2 \times H^1)$ -estimates for $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ without using bootstrapping arguments, but again their a-priori estimates are obtained “within an appropriate Galerkin approximation scheme”. We point out that also in [10,11,15] Ω must have the property that the domain of the $L^2(\Omega)$ -realization of $-\Delta$ is $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, the Nemitski operator associated with f must be Lipschitz continuous from $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ to $H^1(\Omega)$ in [15] and from $D((-\Delta)^{(\alpha+1)/2})$ to $D((-\Delta)^{\alpha/2})$ for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ in [10,11]. Therefore, if one wants to replace $f(u) + g(x)$ by $f(x, u)$, one needs to impose severe smoothness conditions on $f(x, u)$ with respect to the space variable x .

If Ω is unbounded, the embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ is no longer compact, and this poses some additional difficulties even for the existence proof of the attractors $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$. In [6,7], Feireisl circumvented these difficulties by decomposing any solution $u(t, x)$ into the sum $u_1(t, x) + u_2(t, x)$ of two functions, such that $u_1(t, \cdot)$ is asymptotically small, and $u_2(t, \cdot)$ has a compact support which propagates with speed $1/\varepsilon^2$. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the speed of propagation tends to infinity, and, indeed, the estimates obtained

by Feireisl are not uniform with respect to ε . It is therefore apparent that, if one wants to pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, a different approach is needed.

In our previous paper [16] we proved the existence of compact global attractors for damped hyperbolic equations in unbounded domains using the method of tail-estimates (introduced by Wang in [19] for parabolic equations), combined with an argument due to Ball [3] and elaborated by Raugel in [18]. Here we exploit the same techniques to establish an upper semicontinuity result similar to that of Hale and Raugel, when Ω is an unbounded domain and f is critical. Our arguments do not rely on $(H^2 \times H^1)$ -estimates for the attractors $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$. Therefore they also apply to the case of an open set Ω for which the domain of the $L^2(\Omega)$ -realization of $-\Delta$ is not $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ (e.g. if Ω is the exterior of a convex polyhedron).

Before we describe in detail our assumptions and our results, we need to introduce some notation. In this paper, $N = 3$ and Ω is an arbitrary open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, bounded or not. For a and $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ we write $[a..b]$ to denote the set of all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $a \leq m \leq b$. Given a subset S of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and a function $v: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $\tilde{v}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the trivial extension of v defined by $\tilde{v}(x) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus S$. Given a function $g: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\hat{g}$ the Nemitski operator which associates with every function $u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function $\hat{g}(u): \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\hat{g}(u)(x) = g(x, u(x)), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Unless specified otherwise, given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and functions $g, h: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ we write

$$\langle g, h \rangle := \int_{\Omega} \sum_{m=1}^k g_m(x) h_m(x) \, dx,$$

whenever the integral on the right-hand side makes sense.

If $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, Y and X are normed spaces with $Y \subset X$ and if $u: I \rightarrow Y$ is a function which is differentiable as a function into X then we denote its X -valued derivative by $\partial(u; X)$. Similarly, if X is a Banach space and $u: I \rightarrow X$ is integrable as a function into X , then we denote its X -valued integral by $\int_I (u(t); X) \, dt$.

Assumption 1.1.

- (1) $a_0, a_1 \in]0, \infty[$ are constants and $a_{ij}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i, j \in [1..N]$ are functions in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$, $i, j \in [1..N]$, and for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$, $a_0 |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^N a_{ij}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \leq a_1 |\xi|^2$. $A(x) := (a_{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^N$, $x \in \Omega$.
- (2) $\beta: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function with the property that
 - (i) for every $\bar{\varepsilon} \in]0, \infty[$ there is a $C_{\bar{\varepsilon}} \in [0, \infty[$ with $||\beta|^{1/2} u|_{L^2}^2 \leq \bar{\varepsilon} |u|_{H^1}^2 + C_{\bar{\varepsilon}} |u|_{L^2}^2$ for all $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$;
 - (ii) $\lambda_1 := \inf \{ \langle A \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle + \langle \beta u, u \rangle \mid u \in H_0^1(\Omega), |u|_{L^2} = 1 \} > 0$.

Assumption 1.2.

- (1) $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that, for every $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(\cdot, u)$ is (Lebesgue-)measurable, $f(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, $f(x, \cdot)$ is of class C^2 and such that

- $\partial_u f(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $|\partial_{uu} f(x, u)| \leq \overline{C}(1 + |u|)$ for some constant $\overline{C} \in [0, \infty[$, every $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$;
- (2) $f(x, u)u - \overline{\mu}F(x, u) \leq c(x)$ and $F(x, u) \leq c(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and every $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Here, $c \in L^2(\Omega)$ is a given function, $\overline{\mu} \in]0, \infty[$ is a constant and $F: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined, for $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}$, by

$$F(x, u) = \int_0^u f(x, s) \, ds,$$

whenever $f(x, \cdot): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and $F(x, u) = 0$ otherwise.

Note that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 imply the hypotheses of [16].

Let $D(\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon)$ be the set of all $(u, v) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ such that $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $-\beta u + \sum_{ij} (a_{ij} u_{x_j})_{x_i}$ (in the distributional sense) lies in $L^2(\Omega)$. It turns out that the operator

$$\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(u, v) = (-v, (1/\varepsilon)v + (1/\varepsilon)\beta u - (1/\varepsilon) \sum_{ij} (a_{ij} u_{x_j})_{x_i}), \quad (u, v) \in D(\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon)$$

is the generator of a (C_0) -semigroup $e^{-\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon t}$, $t \in [0, \infty[$ on $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, the Nemitski operator $\hat{f}$ is a Lipschitzian map of $H_0^1(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$. Results in [4] then imply that the hyperbolic boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon u_{tt} + u_t + \beta(x)u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij}(x)u_{x_j})_{x_i} &= f(x, u), \quad x \in \Omega, t \in [0, \infty[, \\ u(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t \in [0, \infty[\end{aligned}$$

with Cauchy data at $t = 0$ has a unique (mild) solution $z(t) = (u(t), v(t))$ in $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, given by the “variation-of-constants” formula

$$z(t) = e^{-\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon t} z(0) + \int_0^t e^{-\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(t-s)} (0, (1/\varepsilon)\hat{f}(u(s))) \, ds.$$

For $\varepsilon \in]0, \infty[$ we define π_ε to be the local semiflow on $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ generated by the (mild) solutions of this hyperbolic boundary value problem. We can summarize the results of [16] in the following:

Theorem 1.3. *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, π_ε is a global semiflow and it has a global attractor $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$.*

Analogously, consider the parabolic boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + \beta(x)u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij}(x)u_{x_j})_{x_i} &= f(x, u), \quad x \in \Omega, t \in [0, \infty[, \\ u(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t \in [0, \infty[\end{aligned}$$

with Cauchy data at $t = 0$. Letting $\mathbf{A}$ denote the sectorial operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by the differential operator $u \mapsto \beta u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij} u_{x_j})_{x_i}$, we have that $D(\mathbf{A})$ is the set of all $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that the distribution $\beta u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij} u_{x_j})_{x_i}$ lies in $L^2(\Omega)$. Again, the Cauchy problem has a unique (mild) solution $u(t)$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, given by the “variation-of-constants” formula

$$u(t) = e^{-\mathbf{A}t} u(0) + \int_0^t e^{-\mathbf{A}(t-s)} \hat{f}(u(s)) \, ds.$$

Let $\tilde{\pi}$ be the local semiflow on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ generated by the (mild) solutions of this parabolic boundary value problem. Results in [17] imply that $\tilde{\pi}$ is a global semiflow and has a global attractor $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ (see also [1]). Moreover, it is proved in [17] that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset D(\mathbf{A})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is compact in $D(\mathbf{A})$ endowed with the graph norm.

Let $\Gamma: D(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ be defined by $\Gamma(u) = (u, \mathbf{A}u + \hat{f}(u))$. Set $\mathcal{A}_0 := \Gamma(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. Then we have the following main result of this paper:

Theorem 1.4. *The family $(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in [0, \infty[}$ is upper semicontinuous at $\varepsilon = 0$ with respect to the topology of $H_0^1(\Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$, i.e.*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_0} |y - z|_{H_0^1 \times H^{-1}} = 0.$$

Actually a stronger result is established in Theorem 3.9 below.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we collect a few preliminary results. We begin with an abstract lemma established in [17]:

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $(Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y)$ and $(X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X)$ are (real or complex) Hilbert spaces such that $Y \subset X$, Y is dense in $(X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X)$ and the inclusion $(Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y) \rightarrow (X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X)$ is continuous. Then for every $u \in X$ there exists a unique $w_u \in Y$ such that*

$$\langle v, w_u \rangle_Y = \langle v, u \rangle_X \text{ for all } v \in Y.$$

The map $B: X \rightarrow X$, $u \mapsto w_u$ is linear, symmetric and positive. Let $B^{1/2}$ be a square root of B , i.e. $B^{1/2}: X \rightarrow X$ linear, symmetric and $B^{1/2} \circ B^{1/2} = B$. Then B and $B^{1/2}$ are injective and $R(B)$ is dense in Y . Set $X^{1/2} = X_B^{1/2} = R(B^{1/2})$ and $B^{-1/2}: X^{1/2} \rightarrow X$ be the inverse of $B^{1/2}$. On $X^{1/2}$ the assignment $\langle u, v \rangle_{1/2} := \langle B^{-1/2}u, B^{-1/2}v \rangle_X$ is a complete scalar product. We have $Y = X^{1/2}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{1/2}$.

Now let $\mathbf{A}$ be the sectorial operator on $L^2(\Omega)$ defined by the differential operator $u \mapsto \beta u - \sum_{ij} (a_{ij} u_{x_j})_{x_i}$. Then $\mathbf{A}$ generates a family $X^\alpha = X_{\mathbf{A}}^\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, of fractional power spaces with $X^{-\alpha}$ being the dual of X^α for $\alpha \in]0, \infty[$. We write

$$H_\alpha = X^{\alpha/2}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ the operator $\mathbf{A}$ induces an operator $\mathbf{A}_\alpha: H_\alpha \rightarrow H_{\alpha-2}$. In particular, $H_0 = L^2(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_2$.

Note that, thanks to Assumption 1.1, the scalar product

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H_0^1} = \langle A \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle + \langle \beta u, v \rangle, \quad u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is equivalent to the usual scalar product on $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Moreover,

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H_0^1} = \langle \mathbf{A}_2 u, v \rangle, \quad u \in D(A_2), v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Corollary 2.2. *$H_1 = H_0^1(\Omega)$ with equivalent norms. Consequently $H_{-1} = H^{-1}(\Omega)$ with equivalent norms.*

Proof. Set $(X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X) = (L^2(\Omega), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ and $(Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y) = (H_0^1(\Omega), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_0^1})$. Then Y is dense in X and the inclusion $Y \rightarrow X$ is continuous. Let $B_2: X \rightarrow X$ be the inverse of $\mathbf{A}_2$. Then for all $u \in X$, $B_2 u \in Y$ and for all $v \in Y$

$$\langle v, u \rangle_X = \langle v, B_2 u \rangle_Y.$$

Thus $B_2 = B$ where B is as in Lemma 2.1. Now the lemma implies the corollary. $\square$

Corollary 2.3. *The linear operator $\mathbf{A}_1: H_1 \rightarrow X := H_{-1}$ is self-adjoint hence sectorial on X . Let X_1^α , $\alpha \in [0, \infty[$, be the family of fractional powers generated by $\mathbf{A}_1$. Then $X^{1/2} = L^2(\Omega)$ with equivalent norms.*

Proof. Set $(X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X) = (H_{-1}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_{-1}})$ and $(Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y) = (H_0, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_0})$. Then Y is dense in X and the inclusion $Y \rightarrow X$ is continuous. Let $B_1: X \rightarrow X$ be the inverse of $\mathbf{A}_1$. Then for all $u \in X$, $B_1 u \in Y$ and for all $v \in Y$

$$\langle v, u \rangle_X = \langle B_1 v, B_1 u \rangle_{H_1} = \langle v, B_1 u \rangle_Y.$$

Thus $B_1 = B$ where B is as in Lemma 2.1. Now the lemma implies the corollary. $\square$

We end this section by quoting a result proved in [16], which can be used to rigorously justify formal differentiation of various functionals along (mild) solutions of semilinear evolution equations.

Theorem 2.4. *Let Z be a Banach space and $B: D(B) \subset Z \rightarrow Z$ the infinitesimal generator of a (C_0) -semigroup of linear operators e^{-Bt} on Z , $t \in [0, \infty[$. Let U be open in Z , Y be a normed space and $V: U \rightarrow Y$ be a function which, as a map from Z to Y , is continuous at each point of U and Fréchet differentiable at each point of $U \cap D(B)$. Moreover, let $W: U \times Z \rightarrow Y$ be a function which, as a map from $Z \times Z$ to Y , is continuous and such that $DV(z)(Bz + w) = W(z, w)$ for $z \in U \cap D(B)$ and $w \in Z$. Let $\tau \in]0, \infty[$ and $I := [0, \tau]$. Let $\bar{z} \in U$, $g: I \rightarrow Z$ be continuous and z be a map from I to U such that*

$$z(t) = e^{-Bt} \bar{z} + \int_0^t e^{-B(t-s)} g(s) \, ds, \quad t \in I.$$

Then the map $V \circ z: I \rightarrow Y$ is differentiable and

$$(V \circ z)'(t) = W(z(t), g(t)), \quad t \in I.$$

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In order to establish our main result we need uniform estimates for the attractors $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ in $H_0^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let f be as in Assumption 1.2. Then there is a constant $C \in [0, \infty[$ such that for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ and for a.e. $x \in \Omega$,*

$$|\partial_u f(x, u)| \leq C(1 + |u|^2),$$

$$|\partial_u f(x, v) - \partial_u f(x, u)| \leq C(1 + |u| + |v - u|)|v - u|$$

and

$$|f(x, v) - f(x, u) - \partial_u f(x, u)(v - u)| \leq C(1 + |u| + |v - u|)|v - u|^2.$$

Proof. For all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ and a.e. $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$\partial_u f(x, v) - \partial_u f(x, u) = \int_0^1 \partial_{uu} f(x, u + s(v - u))(v - u) \, ds$$

and

$$f(x, v) - f(x, u) - \partial_u f(x, u)(v - u) = (v - u)^2 \int_0^1 \theta \left[\int_0^1 \partial_{uu} f(x, u + r\theta(v - u)) \, dr \right] d\theta$$

This easily implies the assertions of the lemma. $\square$

Proposition 3.2. *Let f and F be as in Assumption 1.2. Then, for every measurable function $v: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, both $\hat{f}(v)$ and $\hat{F}(v)$ are measurable and for all measurable functions $u, h: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$(3.1) \quad |\hat{f}(u)|_{L^2} \leq |\hat{f}(0)|_{L^2} + C(|u|_{L^2} + |u|_{L^6}^3),$$

$$(3.2) \quad |\hat{f}(u + h) - \hat{f}(u)|_{L^2} \leq C|h|_{L^2} + C(|u|_{L^6}^2 + |h|_{L^6}^2)|h|_{L^6},$$

$$(3.3) \quad |\hat{F}(u)|_{L^1} \leq C(|u|_{L^2}^2/2 + |u|_{L^4}^4/4) + |u|_{L^2}|\hat{f}(0)|_{L^2},$$

$$(3.4) \quad |\hat{F}(u + h) - \hat{F}(u)|_{L^1} \leq (|\hat{f}(0)|_{L^2} + C(|u|_{L^2} + |h|_{L^2}) + 4C(|u|_{L^6}^3 + |h|_{L^6}^3))|h|_{L^2},$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad |\hat{F}(u + h) - \hat{F}(u) - \hat{f}(u)h|_{L^1} \leq (C|h|_{L^2} + C(|u|_{L^6}^2 + |h|_{L^6}^2)|h|_{L^6})|h|_{L^2}.$$

Finally, for every $r \in [3, \infty[$ there is a constant $C(r) \in [0, \infty[$ such that for all $u, h \in H_0^1(\Omega)$

$$(3.6) \quad |\hat{f}(u + h) - \hat{f}(u)|_{H^{-1}} \leq C(r)|h|_{L^2} + C(r)(|u|_{L^6}^2 + |h|_{L^6}^2)|h|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. Lemma 3.1 implies that f satisfies the hypotheses of [16, Proposition 3.11], to which the reader is referred for details. $\square$

For $s \in [2, 6]$ we denote by $C_s \in [0, \infty[$ an imbedding constant of the inclusion induced map from H_1 to $L^s(\Omega)$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let f be as in Assumption 1.2, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval, u be a continuous map from I to H_1 such that u is continuously differentiable into H_0 with $v := \partial(u; H_0)$. Then the composite map $\widehat{f} \circ u: I \rightarrow H_0$ is defined, $\widehat{f} \circ u$ is continuously differentiable into H_{-1} and $g := \partial(\widehat{f} \circ u; H_{-1}) = (\widehat{\partial_u f} \circ u) \cdot v$. Moreover, for every $t \in I$,*

$$(3.7) \quad |g(t)|_{H_{-1}} \leq C(C_2 + C_6|u(t)|_{L^3}^2)|v(t)|_{L^2} \leq C(C_2 + C_6C_3|u(t)|_{H_1}^2)|v(t)|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.2 that for every $w \in H_1$, $\widehat{f}(w) \in H_0$. Thus $\widehat{f} \circ u$ is defined as a function from I to H_0 . Moreover, for every $t \in I$ and $\zeta \in H_1$, the function $\widehat{\partial_u f}(u(t)) \cdot v(t) \cdot \zeta: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and so by Lemma 3.1 and Hölder's inequality

$$|\widehat{\partial_u f}(u(t)) \cdot v(t) \cdot \zeta|_{L^1} \leq C|v(t)|_{L^2}|\zeta|_{L^2} + C|u(t)|_{L^3}^2|v(t)|_{L^2}|\zeta|_{L^6}.$$

It follows that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $g(t) = \widehat{\partial_u f}(u(t)) \cdot v(t) \in H_{-1}$ and (3.7) is satisfied. Moreover, for $s, t \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\widehat{\partial_u f}(u(t)) \cdot v(t) - \widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s)) \cdot v(s)|_{H_{-1}} \\ &= \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} |\widehat{\partial_u f}(u(t)) \cdot v(t) \cdot \zeta - \widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s)) \cdot v(s) \cdot \zeta|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_1(t)(\zeta) + \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_2(t)(\zeta), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$T_1(t)(\zeta) = |(\widehat{\partial_u f}(u(t)) - \widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s))) \cdot v(t) \cdot \zeta|_{L^1}$$

and

$$T_2(t)(\zeta) = |\widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s)) \cdot (v(t) \cdot \zeta - v(s) \cdot \zeta)|_{L^1}$$

By Lemma 3.1 we obtain, for all $\zeta \in H_1$ with $|\zeta|_1 \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(t)(\zeta) &\leq C|(1 + |u(s)| + |u(t) - u(s)|) \cdot |u(t) - u(s)| \cdot \zeta|_{L^2}|v(t)|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C|u(t) - u(s)|_{L^3}|v(t)|_{L^2}|\zeta|_{L^6} \\ &\quad + C|u(s)|_{L^6}|u(t) - u(s)|_{L^6}|v(t)|_{L^2}|\zeta|_{L^6} \\ &\quad + C|u(t) - u(s)|_{L^6}|u(t) - u(s)|_{L^6}|v(t)|_{L^2}|\zeta|_{L^6} \\ &\leq CC_3C_6|u(t) - u(s)|_{H_1}|v(t)|_{L^2} + CC_6^3|u(s)|_{H_1}|u(t) - u(s)|_{H_1}|v(t)|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + CC_6^3|u(t) - u(s)|_{H_1}^2|v(t)|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_2(t)(\zeta) &\leq C|(1 + |u(s)|^2) \cdot \zeta|_{L^2}|v(t) - v(s)|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(|\zeta|_{L^2} + ||u(s)|^2|_{L^3}|\zeta|_{L^6})|v(t) - v(s)|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(C_2 + C_6^3|u(s)|_{H_1}^2)|v(t) - v(s)|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since u is continuous into H_1 and v is continuous into $H_0 = L^2(\Omega)$ it follows that

$$\sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_1(t)(\zeta) + \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_2(t)(\zeta) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow s$$

so the map $(\widehat{\partial_u f} \circ u) \cdot v$ is continuous into H_{-1} .

Now, for $s, t \in I, t \neq s$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (t-s)^{-1} |(\widehat{f} \circ u)(t) - (\widehat{f} \circ u)(s) - \widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s)) \cdot v(s)|_{H_{-1}} \\ &= \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} (t-s)^{-1} |(\widehat{f} \circ u)(t) \cdot \zeta - (\widehat{f} \circ u)(s) \cdot \zeta - \widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s)) \cdot v(s) \cdot \zeta|_{L^1} \\ &\leq (t-s)^{-1} \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_3(t)(\zeta) + (t-s)^{-1} \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_4(t)(\zeta) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$T_3(t)(\zeta) = |g_{t,\zeta}|_{L^1}$$

with $g_{t,\zeta} = (\widehat{f} \circ u)(t) \cdot \zeta - (\widehat{f} \circ u)(s) \cdot \zeta - \widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s)) \cdot (u(t) - u(s)) \cdot \zeta$ and

$$T_4(t)(\zeta) = |\widehat{\partial_u f}(u(s)) \cdot (u(t) - u(s) - v(s)) \cdot \zeta|_{L^1}.$$

Now, by Lemma 3.1, for all $\zeta \in H_1$ with $|\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1$ and for a.e. $x \in \Omega$

$$|g_{t,\zeta}(x)| \leq C(1 + |u(s)(x)| + |u(t)(x) - u(s)(x)|)|u(t)(x) - u(s)(x)|^2 |\zeta(x)|$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} (3.8) \quad T_3(t)(\zeta) &\leq C(|u(t) - u(s)|_{L^3} |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^2} |\zeta|_{L^6}) \\ &\quad + C(|u(s)|_{L^6} |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^6} |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^2} |\zeta|_{L^6}) \\ &\quad + C(|u(t) - u(s)|_{L^6} |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^6} |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^2} |\zeta|_{L^6}) \\ &\leq CC_6(C_3 |u(t) - u(s)|_{H_1} |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + CC_6(C_6^2 |u(s)|_{H_1} |u(t) - u(s)|_{H_1} |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^2}) \\ &\quad + CC_6(C_6^2 |u(t) - u(s)|_{H_1}^2 |u(t) - u(s)|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since u is continuous into H_1 and locally Lipschitzian into $H_0 = L^2(\Omega)$ it follows from (3.8) that

$$(t-s)^{-1} \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_3(t)(\zeta) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow s.$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} T_4(t)(\zeta) &\leq C|(1 + |u(s)|^2) \cdot \zeta|_{L^2} |u(t) - u(s) - v(s)|_{L^2} \\ &\leq (C|\zeta|_{L^2} + C|u(s)|^2 |L^3| \zeta|_{L^6}) |u(t) - u(s) - v(s)|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C(C_2 + CC_6^3 |u(s)|_{H_1}^2) |u(t) - u(s) - v(s)|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

Since $(t-s)^{-1} |u(t) - u(s) - v(s)|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow s$ it follows that

$$(t-s)^{-1} \sup_{\zeta \in H_1, |\zeta|_{H_1} \leq 1} T_4(t)(\zeta) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow s.$$

It follows that $\widehat{f} \circ u$, as a map into H_{-1} , is differentiable at s and $\partial_u(\widehat{f} \circ u; H_{-1})(s) = (\widehat{\partial_u f} \circ u)(s) \cdot v(s)$. The proposition is proved. $\square$

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\varepsilon \in]0, \infty[$ be arbitrary. Define the function $\tilde{V} = \tilde{V}_\varepsilon: H_1 \times H_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$\tilde{V}(u, v) = (1/2)\langle u, u \rangle_{H_1} + (1/2)\varepsilon\langle v, v \rangle - \int_{\Omega} F(x, u(x)) \, dx, \quad (u, v) \in H_1 \times H_0.$$

Let $z: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1 \times H_0$, $z(t) = (z_1(t), z_2(t))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be a solution of π_ε . Then $\tilde{V} \circ z$ is differentiable and

$$(\tilde{V} \circ z)'(t) = -|z_2(t)|_{L^2}^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. This is an application of Theorem 2.4 (for the details see [16, Proposition 4.1]). $\square$

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\varepsilon \in]0, \infty[$ be arbitrary. Define the function $V = V_\varepsilon: H_0 \times H_{-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$V(v, w) = (1/2)\langle v, v \rangle + (1/2)\varepsilon\langle w, w \rangle_{H_{-1}}, \quad (v, w) \in H_0 \times H_{-1}.$$

Let $z: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1 \times H_0$, $z(t) = (z_1(t), z_2(t))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be a solution of π_ε . Then $z = (z_1, z_2)$ is differentiable as a map into $H_0 \times H_{-1}$ with $z_2 = \partial(z_1; H_0)$. Let $u = z_1$, $v = z_2$, $w = \partial(v; H_{-1})$ and $g = (\widehat{\partial_u f} \circ u) \cdot v$. Then the function $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \mapsto V(v(t), w(t))$ is differentiable and for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\alpha'(t) = -\langle w(t), w(t) \rangle_{H_{-1}} + \langle g(t), w(t) \rangle_{H_{-1}}.$$

Proof. For $\varepsilon \in]0, \infty[$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ let $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, \kappa}: H_\kappa \times H_{\kappa-1} \rightarrow H_{\kappa-1} \times H_{\kappa-2}$ be defined by

$$\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, \kappa}(z) = (-z_2, (1/\varepsilon)(z_2 + \mathbf{A}_\kappa z_1)), \quad z = (z_1, z_2) \in H_\kappa \times H_{\kappa-1}.$$

It follows that $-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, \kappa}$ is m -dissipative on $H_{\kappa-1} \times H_{\kappa-2}$ (cf [16, proof of Proposition 3.6]). Moreover, if $z: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1 \times H_0$ is a solution of π_ε , then

$$\begin{aligned} z(t) &= e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 2}(t-t_0)} z(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t (e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 2}(t-s)} (0, (1/\varepsilon)\widehat{f}(z_1(s)))) ; H_1 \times H_0 \, ds \\ &= e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1}(t-t_0)} z(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t (e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1}(t-s)} (0, (1/\varepsilon)\widehat{f}(z_1(s)))) ; H_0 \times H_{-1} \, ds, \\ t, t_0 &\in \mathbb{R}, t_0 \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

Since $z(t_0) \in D(\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1})$ and $t \mapsto (0, (1/\varepsilon)\widehat{f}(z_1(s)))$ is continuous into $D(\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1})$ it follows from [9, proof of Theorem II.1.3 (i)] that $z = (u, v)$ is differentiable as a map into $H_0 \times H_{-1}$ with $v = \partial(u; H_0)$. Now, in H_{-1} ,

$$w = \partial(v; H_{-1}) = (1/\varepsilon)(v - \mathbf{A}_1 \circ u + \widehat{f} \circ u) = (1/\varepsilon)(v - \mathbf{A}_0 \circ u + \widehat{f} \circ u).$$

It follows from Proposition 3.3 that w is differentiable into H_{-2} and

$$\partial(w; H_{-2}) = (1/\varepsilon)(w - \mathbf{A}_0 \circ v + g).$$

Again [9, proof of Theorem II.1.3 (i)] implies that
(3.9)

$$\begin{aligned} (v, w)(t) &= e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, -1}(t-t_0)}(v, w)(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t (e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, -1}(t-s)}(0, (1/\varepsilon)g(s)); H_{-2} \times H_{-3}) \, ds \\ &= e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1}(t-t_0)}(v, w)(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t (e^{-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1}(t-s)}(0, (1/\varepsilon)g(s)); H_0 \times H_{-1}) \, ds, \\ t, t_0 &\in \mathbb{R}, t_0 \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

Now note that the function $V = V_\varepsilon$ is Fréchet differentiable and

$$DV(v, w)(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}) = \langle v, \tilde{v} \rangle_{H_0} + \varepsilon \langle w, \tilde{w} \rangle_{H_{-1}}.$$

Thus for $(u, v) \in D(-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1}) = H_1 \times H_0$ and $(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}) \in H_0 \times H_{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} DV(v, w)(-\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon, 1}(v, w) + (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w})) &= \langle v, w + \tilde{v} \rangle_{H_0} \\ &+ \varepsilon \langle w, -(1/\varepsilon)w - (1/\varepsilon)\mathbf{A}_1 v + \tilde{w} \rangle_{H_{-1}} = \langle v, \tilde{v} \rangle_{H_0} - \langle w, w \rangle_{H_{-1}} + \varepsilon \langle w, \tilde{w} \rangle_{H_{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that

$$\langle w, \mathbf{A}_1 v \rangle_{H_{-1}} = \langle \mathbf{A}_1^{-1} w, \mathbf{A}_1^{-1} \mathbf{A}_1 v \rangle_{H_1} = \langle \mathbf{A}_1^{-1} w, v \rangle_{H_1} = \langle w, v \rangle_{H_0}$$

as $\mathbf{A}_1^{-1} w = \mathbf{A}_2^{-1} w \in H_2$. Defining $W: (H_0 \times H_{-1}) \times (H_0 \times H_{-1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$W((v, w), (\tilde{v}, \tilde{w})) = \langle v, \tilde{v} \rangle_{H_0} - \langle w, w \rangle_{H_{-1}} + \varepsilon \langle w, \tilde{w} \rangle_{H_{-1}}$$

we see that W is continuous. Now it follows from (3.9) and Theorem 2.4 that $\alpha = V_\varepsilon \circ (v, w)$ is differentiable and

$$\alpha'(t) = -\langle w(t), w(t) \rangle_{H_{-1}} + \langle w(t), g(t) \rangle_{H_{-1}}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, \infty[$ be arbitrary. Then for every $r \in [0, \infty[$ there is a constant $C(r, \varepsilon_0) \in [0, \infty[$ such that whenever $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $z = (u, v): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1 \times H_0$ is a solution of π_ε with $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} (|u(t)|_{H_1}^2 + \varepsilon |v(t)|_{H_0}^2) \leq r$ and $w := \partial(v; H_{-1})$, then*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} (|v(t)|_{H_0}^2 + \varepsilon |w(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2) \leq C(r, \varepsilon_0).$$

Proof. By $C_i(r) \in [0, \infty[$, resp. $C_i(r, \varepsilon_0) \in [0, \infty[$ we denote various constants depending only on r , resp. on r and ε_0 , but independent of $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$ and the choice of a solution z of π_ε with $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} (|u(t)|_{H_1}^2 + \varepsilon |v(t)|_{H_0}^2) \leq r$.

Let $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$ be arbitrary, $\alpha(t) = V_\varepsilon(v(t), w(t))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $g = (\widehat{\partial_u f} \circ u) \cdot v$. Using (3.7) we see that

$$(3.10) \quad |g(t)|_{H_{-1}} \leq C(1 + C_6 C_3^2 r^2) |v(t)|_{H_0}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proposition 3.5 implies that

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha'(t) &\leq -|w(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2 + (1/2)|g(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2 + (1/2)|w(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2 \\ &\leq -(1/2)|w(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2 + (1/2)C^2(1 + C_6 C_3^2 r^2)^2 |v(t)|_{H_0}^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain, for every $k \in]0, \infty[$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'(t) + k\alpha(t) &\leq (-(1/2) + (k\varepsilon/2))|w(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2 \\ &\quad + ((1/2)C^2(1 + C_6 C_3^2 r^2)^2 + (k/2))|v(t)|_{H_0}^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $k = k(\varepsilon_0) \in]0, \infty[$ such that $(-(1/2) + (k\varepsilon_0/2)) < 0$. Hence we obtain

$$\alpha'(t) + k\alpha(t) \leq C_1(r, \varepsilon_0) |v(t)|_{H_0}^2 \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Using Propositions 3.4 and 3.2 we see that

$$\int_{t_0}^t |v(s)|_{H_0}^2 ds \leq C_2(r, \varepsilon_0), \quad t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t_0 \leq t.$$

It follows that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha(t) &= e^{-k(t-t_0)} \alpha(t_0) + C_1(r, \varepsilon_0) \int_{t_0}^t e^{-k(t-s)} |v(s)|_{H_0}^2 ds \\ &\leq e^{-k(t-t_0)} \alpha(t_0) + C_3(r, \varepsilon_0), \quad t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t_0 \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of α we thus obtain from (3.12)

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} (1/2)|v(t)|_{H_0}^2 + (1/2)\varepsilon|w(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2 &\leq e^{-k(t-t_0)} ((1/2)|v(t_0)|_{H_0}^2 + (1/2)\varepsilon|w(t_0)|_{H_{-1}}^2) \\ &\quad + C_3(r, \varepsilon_0), \quad t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t_0 \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

Since for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon w(t) = -v(t) - \mathbf{A}_1 u(t) + \hat{f}(u(t))$ in H_{-1} , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon|w(t)|_{H_{-1}} &\leq |v(t)|_{H_{-1}} + |u(t)|_{H_1} + |\hat{f}(u(t))|_{H_{-1}} \\ &\leq |v(t)|_{H_{-1}} + C_5(r) \leq C_6(r)\varepsilon^{-1/2} + C_5(r), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(3.14) \quad \varepsilon|w(t_0)|_{H_{-1}}^2 \leq (1/\varepsilon)(C_6(r)\varepsilon^{-1/2} + C_5(r))^2.$$

Furthermore,

$$(3.15) \quad |v(t_0)|_{H_0}^2 \leq r/\varepsilon.$$

Inserting (3.14) and (3.15) into (3.13) and letting $t_0 \rightarrow -\infty$ we thus see that

$$|v(t)|_{H_0}^2 + \varepsilon |w(t)|_{H_{-1}}^2 \leq 2C_3(r, \varepsilon_0), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Fix a C^∞ -function $\bar{\vartheta}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\bar{\vartheta}(s) = 0$ for $s \in]-\infty, 1]$ and $\bar{\vartheta}(s) = 1$ for $s \in [2, \infty[$. Let

$$\vartheta := \bar{\vartheta}^2.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let the functions $\bar{\vartheta}_k: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\vartheta_k: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\bar{\vartheta}_k(x) = \bar{\vartheta}(|x|^2/k^2) \text{ and } \vartheta_k(x) = \vartheta(|x|^2/k^2), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

The following theorem (actually a rephrasing of Theorem 4.4 in [16]) provides the “tail-estimates” mentioned in the Introduction:

Theorem 3.7. *Let Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 be satisfied. Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be fixed. Choose δ and $\nu \in]0, \infty[$ with*

$$\nu \leq \min(1, \bar{\mu}/2), \quad \lambda_1 - \delta > 0 \text{ and } 1 - 2\delta\varepsilon_0 \geq 0.$$

Under these hypotheses, there is a constant $c' \in [0, \infty[$ and for every $R \in [0, \infty[$ there are constants $M' = M'(R)$, $c_k = c_k(R) \in [0, \infty[$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $c_k \rightarrow 0$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that for every $\tau_0 \in [0, \infty[$, every ε , $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and every solution $z(\cdot)$ of π_ε on $I = [0, \tau_0]$ with $|z(0)|_Z \leq R$

$$|z_1(t)|_{H_1}^2 + \varepsilon |z_2(t)|_{H_0}^2 \leq c' + M'e^{-2\delta\nu t}, \quad t \in I.$$

If $|z(t)|_Z \leq R$ for $t \in I$, then

$$|\vartheta_k z_1(t)|_{H_1}^2 + \varepsilon |\vartheta_k z_2(t)|_{H_0}^2 \leq c_k + M'e^{-2\delta\nu t}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, t \in I.$$

Now we can prove the following fundamental result:

Theorem 3.8. *Let $(\varepsilon_n)_n$ be a sequence of positive numbers converging to 0. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $z_n = (u_n, v_n): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1 \times H_0$ be a solution of π_{ε_n} such that*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} (|u_n(t)|_{H_1}^2 + \varepsilon_n |v_n(t)|_{H_0}^2) \leq r < \infty.$$

Then, for every $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, a subsequence of $(z_n)_n$ converges in $H_1 \times H_{-\alpha}$, uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, to a function $z: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1 \times H_0$ with $z = (u, v)$, where u is a solution of $\tilde{\pi}$ and $v = \partial(u; H_0)$.

Proof. We may assume that $\varepsilon_n \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$ for some $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, \infty[$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Write $u_n = z_{n,1}$ and $v_n = z_{n,2}$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{u_n(t) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively compact in H_0 . Let ϑ_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, be as above. Then, choosing $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and using Theorem 3.7 we can make $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\vartheta_k u_n(t)|_{H_1}$ as small as we wish. Therefore, by a Kuratowski measure of noncompactness argument, we only have to prove that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $S_k = \{(1 - \vartheta_k)u_n(t) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively compact in H_0 . Let U be the ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with radius $2k$ centered at zero. Then $(1 - \vartheta_k)|U \in C_0^1(U)$, so $(1 - \vartheta_k)\tilde{u}_n(t)|U \in H_0^1(U)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $H_0^1(U)$ imbeds compactly in $L^2(U)$ and $(1 - \vartheta_k)\tilde{u}_n(t)|(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus U) \equiv 0$, it follows that, indeed, S_k is relatively compact in H_0 . This proves our claim.

Since, by Proposition 3.6, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, u_n is differentiable into H_0 and $v_n = \partial(u_n; H_0)$ is bounded in H_0 uniformly $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we may assume, using the above claim and Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, and taking subsequences if necessary, that $(u_n)_n$ converges in H_0 , uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, to a continuous function $u: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_0$. Moreover, since, for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $(u_n(t))_n$ has a subsequence that is weakly convergent in H_1 , we see that u takes its values in H_1 . Let $w_n = \partial(v; H_{-1})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(3.16) \quad \varepsilon_n w_n(t) = -v_n(t) - \mathbf{A}_0 u_n(t) + \widehat{f}(u_n(t))$$

in H_{-1} . Now, uniformly for t lying in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, $\widehat{f}(u_n(t)) \rightarrow \widehat{f}(u(t))$ in H_{-1} (by Proposition 3.2), $\mathbf{A}_0 u_n(t) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_0 u(t)$ in H_{-2} and $\varepsilon_n w_n(t) \rightarrow 0$ in H_{-1} (by Proposition 3.6). It follows from (3.16) that, uniformly for t in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, $v_n(t) \rightarrow v(t)$ in H_{-2} , where $v: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_{-2}$ is a continuous map such that, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$v(t) = -\mathbf{A}_0 u(t) + \widehat{f}(u(t))$$

in H_{-2} . It follows that u is differentiable into H_{-2} and $v = \partial(u; H_{-2})$. Then u is differentiable into H_{-3} and, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\partial(u; H_{-3})(t) = -\mathbf{A}_{-1} u(t) + \widehat{f}(u(t))$$

in H_{-3} . Since $\widehat{f} \circ u$ is continuous into $D(\mathbf{A}_{-1}) = H_{-1}$ it follows that

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} u(t) &= e^{-\mathbf{A}_{-1}(t-t_0)} u(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t (e^{-\mathbf{A}_{-1}(t-s)} \widehat{f}(u(s)); H_{-3}) ds \\ &= e^{-\mathbf{A}_{-1}(t-t_0)} u(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t (e^{-\mathbf{A}_{-1}(t-s)} \widehat{f}(u(s)); H_{-1}) ds, \quad t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, t_0 \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that u is a solution of $\tilde{\pi}$. To this end let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary. Let $\tilde{u}: [0, \infty[\rightarrow H_1$ be the solution of $\tilde{\pi}$ with $\tilde{u}(0) = u(t_0)$ ($\tilde{u}$ exists by results in [17]). We must show that $\tilde{u}(s) = u(s+t_0)$ for all $s \in [0, \infty[$. If not, then there is a $s_0 \geq 0$ with $\tilde{u}(s_0) = u(s_0 + t_0)$ and $\tilde{u}(s_n) \neq u(s_n + t_0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $(s_n)_n$ is a

sequence with $s_n \rightarrow s_0^+$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Corollary 2.3 there is a constant $C \in [0, \infty[$ such that

$$|e^{-\mathbf{A}_1 t} w|_{H_0} \leq C t^{-1/2} |w|_{H_{-1}}, \quad w \in H_{-1}, t \in]0, \infty[.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.2, for every $b \in]0, \infty[$ there is an $L(b) \in]0, \infty[$ such that for all $w_i \in H_1$, $|w_i|_{H_1} \leq b$, $i = 1, 2$,

$$|\widehat{f}(w_2) - \widehat{f}(w_1)|_{H_{-1}} \leq L(b) |w_2 - w_1|_{H_0}.$$

There is an $\bar{s} \in]s_0, \infty[$ such that whenever $s \in [s_0, \bar{s}]$ then $|u(s + t_0)|_{H_1} < r + 1$ and $|\tilde{u}(s)|_{H_1} < r + 1$. Let $L = L(b)$ where $b = r + 1$. Choosing $\bar{s}$ smaller, if necessary, we can assume that

$$(3.18) \quad CL(\bar{s} - s_0)^{1/2}/2 < 1.$$

It follows that, for each $s \in [s_0, \bar{s}]$,

$$u(s + t_0) - \tilde{u}(s) = \int_{s_0}^s e^{-\mathbf{A}_1(s-r)} [\widehat{f}(u(r + t_0)) - \widehat{f}(\tilde{u}(r))] dr$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} |u(s + t_0) - \tilde{u}(s)|_{H_0} &\leq C \int_{s_0}^s (s - r)^{-1/2} L[|u(r + t_0) - \tilde{u}(r)|_{H_0}] dr \\ &\leq CL(\bar{s} - s_0)^{1/2}/2 \sup_{r \in [s_0, \bar{s}]} |u(r + t_0) - \tilde{u}(r)|_{H_0}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (3.18), we obtain that $u(s + t_0) = \tilde{u}(s)$ for $s \in [s_0, \bar{s}]$, a contradiction, which proves our claim.

We now claim that $u_n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in H_1 , uniformly for t lying in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. If this claim is not true, then there is a strictly increasing sequence $(n_k)_n$ in $\mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(t_k)_k$ in $\mathbb{R}$ converging to some $t_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.19) \quad \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |u_{n_k}(t_k) - u(t_\infty)|_{H_1} > 0.$$

For $\varepsilon \in]0, \infty[$ define the function $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon: H_1 \times H_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(z) &= (1/2)\varepsilon \langle \delta z_1 + z_2, \delta z_1 + z_2 \rangle + (1/2) \langle A \nabla z_1, \nabla z_1 \rangle \\ &\quad + (1/2) \langle (\beta - \delta + \delta^2 \varepsilon) z_1, z_1 \rangle - \int_{\Omega} F(x, z_1(x)) dx \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta \in]0, \infty[$ is such that $\lambda_1 - \delta > 0$ and $1 - 2\delta\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Note that

$$\|u\|^2 = \langle A \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle + \langle (\beta - \delta)u, u \rangle, \quad u \in H_1$$

defines a norm on H_1 equivalent to the usual norm on H_1 . Let $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2): [0, \infty[\rightarrow Z$ be an arbitrary solution of π_ε . Using Theorem 2.4 (cf [16,

Proposition 4.1]) one can see that the function $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \circ \zeta$ is continuously differentiable and for every $t \in [0, \infty[$

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \circ \zeta)'(t) + 2\delta\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon(\zeta(t)) &= \int_{\Omega} (2\delta\varepsilon - 1)(\delta\zeta_1(t)(x) + \zeta_2(t)(x))^2 dx \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} \delta\zeta_1(t)(x)f(x, \zeta_1(t)(x)) dx - 2\delta \int_{\Omega} F(x, \zeta_1(t)(x)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, define $\mathcal{F}_0: H_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_0(u) = (1/2)\langle A\nabla u, \nabla u \rangle + (1/2)\langle (\beta - \delta)u, u \rangle - \int_{\Omega} F(x, u(x)) dx, \quad u \in H_1.$$

Every solution $\xi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1$ of $\tilde{\pi}$ is differentiable into H_1 so the function $\mathcal{F}_0 \circ \xi$ is differentiable and a simple computation shows that for $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{F}_0 \circ \xi)'(t) + 2\delta(\mathcal{F}_0 \circ \xi)(t) &= -\langle \delta\xi(t) + \eta(t), \delta\xi(t) + \eta(t) \rangle \\ &+ \int_{\Omega} [\delta\xi(t)(x)f(x, \xi(t)(x)) - 2\delta F(x, \xi(t)(x))] dx \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta(t) = -\mathbf{A}_1\xi(t) + \widehat{f}(\xi(t))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Fix $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\zeta_k(t) = z_{n_k}(t_k - l + t)$ and $\zeta(t) = (u(t_\infty - l + t), v(t_\infty - l + t))$ for $t \in [0, \infty[$. Then (3.20) and (3.21) imply that

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_{n_k}}(z_{n_k}(t_k)) &= e^{-2\delta l} \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_{n_k}}(z_{n_k}(t_k - l)) \\ &+ (2\delta\varepsilon_{n_k} - 1) \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds \\ &+ \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x)f(x, \zeta_{k,1}(s)(x)) dx - 2\delta \int_{\Omega} F(x, \zeta_{k,1}(s)(x)) dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_0(u(t_\infty)) &= e^{-2\delta l} \mathcal{F}_0(u(t_\infty - l)) \\ &- \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_1(s)(x) + \zeta_2(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds \\ &+ \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \delta\zeta_1(s)(x)f(x, \zeta_1(s)(x)) dx - 2\delta \int_{\Omega} F(x, \zeta_1(s)(x)) dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\zeta_{k,1}(s) \rightarrow \zeta_1(s)$ in H_0 , uniformly for s lying in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, we obtain from Proposition 3.2 that

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x)f(x, \zeta_{k,1}(s)(x)) dx - 2\delta \int_{\Omega} F(x, \zeta_{k,1}(s)(x)) dx \right) ds \\ &\rightarrow \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \delta\zeta_1(s)(x)f(x, \zeta_1(s)(x)) dx - 2\delta \int_{\Omega} F(x, \zeta_1(s)(x)) dx \right) ds \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We claim that

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (2\delta\varepsilon_{n_k} - 1) \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds \\ & \leq - \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_1(s)(x) + \zeta_2(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, since $1 - 2\delta\varepsilon_{n_k} \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have by Fatou's lemma

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (2\delta\varepsilon_{n_k} - 1) \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds \\ & = - \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (1 - 2\delta\varepsilon_{n_k}) \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds \\ & = - \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds \\ & \leq - \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)(x))^2 dx \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let $s \in [0, l]$ be arbitrary.

Since $((\zeta_{k,1}(s), \zeta_{k,2}(s)))_k$ converges to $(\zeta_1(s), \zeta_2(s))$ weakly in $H_1 \times H_0$ it follows that $((\zeta_{k,1}(s), \delta\zeta_{k,1}(s) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)))_k$ converges to $(\zeta_1(s), \delta\zeta_1(s) + \zeta_2(s))$ weakly in $H_1 \times H_0$. It follows that for every $v \in L^2(\Omega)$

$$\langle v, \delta\zeta_{k,1}(s) + \zeta_{k,2}(s) \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, \delta\zeta_1(s) + \zeta_2(s) \rangle \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Taking $v = (\delta\zeta_1(s) + \delta\zeta_2(s))$ we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\delta\zeta_1(s) + \delta\zeta_2(s))|_{L^2}^2 = \langle (\delta\zeta_1(s) + \delta\zeta_2(s)), (\delta\zeta_1(s) + \delta\zeta_2(s)) \rangle \\ & = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\delta\zeta_1(s) + \delta\zeta_2(s)), (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s) + \delta\zeta_{k,2}(s)) \rangle \\ & \leq |(\delta\zeta_1(s) + \delta\zeta_2(s))|_{L^2} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} |(\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s) + \delta\zeta_{k,2}(s))|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(3.27) \quad \int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_1(s)(x) + \zeta_2(s)(x))^2 dx \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (\delta\zeta_{k,1}(s)(x) + \zeta_{k,2}(s)(x))^2 dx.$$

Inequalities (3.27) and (3.26) prove (3.25). Since, by Proposition 3.2,

$$\int_{\Omega} F(x, u_{n_k}(t_k)(x)) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} F(x, u(t_{\infty})(x)) dx$$

we obtain, using Proposition 3.6, that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_{n_k}}(z_{n_k}(t_k)) = (1/2) \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t_k)\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} F(x, u(t_{\infty})(x)) dx$$

Moreover, there is a constant $C' \in]0, \infty[$ such that

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon_{n_k}}(z_{n_k}(t))| + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{F}_0(u(t))| \leq C'.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & (1/2) \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t_k)\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} F(x, u(t_{\infty})(x)) \, dx \leq e^{-2\delta l} C' \\ & - \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} (\delta \zeta_1(s)(x) + \zeta_2(s)(x))^2 \, dx \right) \, ds \\ & + \int_0^l e^{-2\delta(l-s)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \delta \zeta_1(s)(x) f(x, \zeta_1(s)(x)) \, dx - 2\delta \int_{\Omega} F(x, \zeta_1(s)(x)) \, dx \right) \, ds \\ & = e^{-2\delta l} C' + (1/2) \|u(t_{\infty})\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} F(x, u(t_{\infty})(x)) \, dx \\ & - e^{-2\delta l} \mathcal{F}_0(u(t_{\infty} - l)) \leq 2e^{-2\delta l} C' + (1/2) \|u(t_{\infty})\|^2 - \int_{\Omega} F(x, u(t_{\infty})(x)) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t_k)\|^2 \leq 4e^{-2\delta l} C' + \|u(t_{\infty})\|^2$$

so

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t_k)\| \leq \|u(t_{\infty})\|.$$

Since $(u_{n_k}(t_{n_k}))_k$ converges to $u(t_{\infty})$ weakly in H_1 we have

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{n_k}(t_{n_k})\| \geq \|u(t_{\infty})\|.$$

Altogether we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{n_k}(t_{n_k})\| = \|u(t_{\infty})\|.$$

This implies that $(u_{n_k}(t_{n_k}))_k$ converges to $u(t_{\infty})$ strongly in H_1 , a contradiction to (3.19). Thus, indeed, $u_n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in H_1 , uniformly for t lying in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$.

Now (3.16) implies that $v_n(t) \rightarrow v(t)$ in H_{-1} , uniformly for t lying in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. Since $(v_n)_n$ is bounded in H_0 , interpolation between H_0 and H_{-1} (cf. [17]) now implies that $v_n(t) \rightarrow v(t)$ in $H_{-\alpha}$, uniformly for t lying in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. The proof is complete. $\square$

Now we obtain the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.9. *For every $\alpha \in]0, 1]$ the family $(\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in]0, \infty[}$ is upper semicontinuous at $\varepsilon = 0$ with respect to the topology of $H_1 \times H_{-\alpha}$, i.e.*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_0} |y - z|_{H_1 \times H_{-\alpha}} = 0.$$

Proof. Using the first part of Theorem 3.7, choosing $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, \infty[$ arbitrarily and $\delta \in]0, \infty[$ such that $\lambda_1 - \delta > 0$ and $1 - 2\delta\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and noting that the constant c' in that theorem is independent of $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$, it follows that for all $\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]$ and all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$,

$$|u|_{H_1}^2 + \varepsilon|v|_{H_0}^2 \leq 2c'.$$

Now an obvious contradiction argument using Theorem 3.8 completes the proof of our main result. $\square$

Remark. Theorem 3.9 and Corollary 2.2 imply Theorem 1.4.

REFERENCES

1. J. M. Arrieta, J. W. Cholewa, T. Dłotko and A. Rodriguez-Bernal, *Asymptotic behavior and attractors for reaction diffusion equations in unbounded domains*, Nonlinear Analysis **56** (2004), 515–554.
2. A. V. Babin and M. I. Vishik, *Regular attractors of semigroups and evolution equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **62** (1983), 441–491.
3. J. M. Ball, *Global attractors for damped semilinear wave equations. Partial differential equations and applications*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **10** (2004), 31–52.
4. T. Cazenave and A. Haraux, *An Introduction to Semilinear Evolution Equations*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1998.
5. J. Cholewa and T. Dłotko, *Global Attractors in Abstract Parabolic Problems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
6. E. Feireisl, *Attractors for semilinear damped wave equations on $\mathbb{R}^3$* , Nonlinear Analysis **23** (1994), 187–195.
7. ———, *Asymptotic behaviour and attractors for semilinear damped wave equations with a supercritical exponent*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh **125A** (1995), 1051–1062.
8. J. M. Ghidaglia and R. Temam, *Attractors for damped nonlinear hyperbolic equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **66** (1987), 273–319.
9. J. A. Goldstein, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and applications*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1985.
10. M. Grasselli and V. Pata, *On the damped semilinear wave equation with critical exponent. Dynamical systems and differential equations (Wilmington, NC, 2002)*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. suppl. (2003), 351–358.
11. ———, *Asymptotic behavior of a parabolic-hyperbolic system*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **3** (2004), 849–881.
12. J. Hale, *Asymptotic Behavior of Dissipative Systems*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1988.
13. J. Hale and G. Raugel, *Upper semicontinuity of the attractor for a singularly perturbed hyperbolic equation*, J. Differential Equations **73** (1988), 197–214.
14. A. Haraux, *Two remarks on hyperbolic dissipative problems*, Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications. Collège de France seminar, Vol. VII (Paris, 1983–1984), Pitman, Boston, 1985, pp. 161–179.
15. V. Pata and S. Zelik, *A remark on the damped wave equation*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **5** (2006), 609–614.

- 16. M. Prizzi and K. P. Rybakowski, *Attractors for damped hyperbolic equations on arbitrary unbounded domains*, Preprint <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0601319>, submitted.
- 17. ———, *Attractors for reaction-diffusion equations on arbitrary unbounded domains*, Preprint <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0702333>, Topological Methods in Nonl. Anal. (to appear).
- 18. G. Raugel, *Global attractors in partial differential equations*, Handbook of dynamical systems, Vol. 2, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002, pp. 885–982.
- 19. B. Wang, *Attractors for reaction-diffusion equations in unbounded domains*, Physica D **179** (1999), 41–52.

MARTINO PRIZZI, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TRIESTE, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E INFORMATICA, VIA VALERIO, 12, 34127 TRIESTE, ITALY

E-mail address: `prizzi@ dsm.univ.trieste.it`

KRZYSZTOF P. RYBAKOWSKI, UNIVERSITÄT ROSTOCK, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄTSPLATZ 1, 18055 ROSTOCK, GERMANY

E-mail address: `krzysztof.rybakowski@ matematik.uni-rostock.de`